Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 16 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

92-1091

NO.
92-1091

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1992

TO THE HONORABLE JUSTICE CLARENCE THOMAS, JUSTICE SUTER , JUSTICE ~~SCALIA~~

CLARENCE H. HOLDING, DBA. ,
CLARENCE H. HOLDING & COMPANY, PETITIONER,

VS.

LEWIS W. BROTHERS, JR., MAX ZOECHLER, JOHN W. PARTHUM, BRIAN SILVERMAN, MADELINE T. WATTS,
RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Clarence Houston Holding

CLARENCE H. HOLDING PRO SE
ROUTE1 BOX 2
MOUNT PLEASANT PLANTATION
HAGUE, VIRGINIA 22469
(804) 472 2026

COUNSEL PRO SE FOR PETITIONER

RECEIVED
DEC 18 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED TO THE COURT FOR REVIEW

1WHEN JURY TRIAL IS DENIED , AFYER REPEATED ORAL REQUESTS FOR JURY TRIAL , AND MANY PLEADINS DEMANDIND JURY TRIAL WHICH WAS EITHER ADNORED OR REFUSED WHICH IS GUARANTEED BY 7th AMENDMENT TO U.S. CONSTITUTION GROUNDS FOR JUDG ment or new trial.

2. IS COMFLICT OF INTEREST BY THE JUSTICES OF SUPREME COU RT SUBJECT TO JUDGMENT OR NEW TRIAL . EVEN WHEN BROUGHT TO THEIR ATTENTION BEFORE ISSUING THEIR ORDERS ISSUED ORDERS WITH THE JUSTICE IN CONFLICT OF INTEREST ON THE THE BENCH . CGASE OF JUSTICE LACY WHO WAS JUDGE ON THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION BEFORE COMMING TO SUPREME COURT. JUDGE LACY WORKED WITH BROTHERS, ZOECKLER, PARTHUM, SILVERMA AND WERE and now N, FOR THEY ARE/MEMBERS OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION, SECURITIES DIVISION . THUS MAKING A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. JUDGE POFF AND JUDGE CHRISTINE AFTER BEING INFORME OF THE CONFLICT OF INTEREEST MADE 5 DECESIONS AFTER HAVING KNOW LEDGE OF ITWHICH MAKES THEM ACCOMPLISHERS IN THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST . AT THE HEARING july 29, JULY 30 AND 3 other TIMES LATER WITH THE ORDERS ISSUE ON AUGUST 14, 1992, SEPTEMB ER 12,9992 (1992) . WHICH GIVES WAY FOR JUDGMENT FOR HOLDING OR GRANTING NEW TRIAL .

TRIAL
3JUDGE WAS BIAS, PREDJICE, UNFAIR, PRO DEFENDANTS, WOULD NOT LLOW JURY TRIAL , WOULD NOT ACCEPT THE STATEMENT OF FACT

S FOR APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT OF VA. WOULD TRY TO FX ACCEPT ABLE STATEMENT , FOR REDORD OR HELP CURE IT.

$.THERE WERE NO FACT FINDING PROBES . THERE WERE NO EVIDEN VE ALLOWED , OR WITNESSES TO TESTIFY , NO DEFENDANTS, NO PART ICIPANTS ALLOWED TO TESTIFY, LIKE SHERIFF OG ESSEX COUNTY AND COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY WHO WERE A PART OF THE CASE. NO EVIDENC CE WERE TAKEN , GIVEN, ALLOWED. , NO STATEMENTS AS TO THE FACTURAL ISSUES OF THE CASE. NO HEARINGS ON FACT FINDINGS,

THE DECISIONS REACHED BY THE COURT THOUGH ENTIRELY ERR ONEOUS WERE BASED UPON PLEADINGS,, MOTIONS,OBJECTIONS BY THE PARTIES ,WHICH WERE OF NO VALUE. JUDGE SPRUILL WAS IN A HURRY TO DENY MR. HOLDING JUSTICE AND JUDGMENT, DAMAGES. A GREAT CASE OF ABUNDANCE OF ABUSE OF PROCESS. THIS LEADS TO JUDGMENT FOR HOLDING OR GRANT OF NEW TRIAL .

5. VIOLATION OF SEC 18.2-499 & 500)F THE CODE OF VA1950 AS AMENDED. CONSPIRACY. THE DEFENDANTS IN COLLUSION DID CONSPIRE IN CONSPIRACY TO HARM MR HOLDING AND DID.

6 . MISUSE OF SEC 8.01-271,1 OF VA CODE 950 . WHEN JOHN WARE USED THE STATUTE TO LIE ABOUT THE PLEADINGS OF HOLDING IN ORDER 12/12/91 , 1/3/92; 3 /6 /92 ORDERS IN TRIAL COURT AND WAS AWARDED $250, $500 SANCTIONS AGAINST HOLDING ILLEGALLY BY LYING WHEN HOLDING HAS BEEN WORKING WITH THE LAW FOR 43 YEARS PROBABLY LONGER THAN WARE IS OLD. SHOULD REVERSED JUDGMENT FOR HOLDING

/KHOWINGLY INTENTIOAL
7. R. MCKENNEY COUNSEL FOR BROTHERS ET AL LIED IN WRITING THE ORDERS ON 12/12/91; 1/3/92; 3/6/93 EVEN USED STATUTE TO DISPENBE WITH ENDORSEMENT SO MR. HOLDING WOULDN,T HAVE LEGA GAL RIGHT TO SEE AND ENDORSE OR CORRECT THE ORDERS HE WAS LYING AND ORDERS WHICH WERE ERROEOUES , WITHOUT MERIT, OUT RIGHT FALSE. THESE ORDERS SHOULD BE REVERSED AND JUDGMENT FOR HOLDING OR NEW TRIAL .DELIBERATE USE OF STATUTE FOR CLIENT.

8.
8VIOLATION OF SEC 8.01-243 OF THE CODE OF VA. 1950 PERSONAL INJURIES 2 YR LIMITATIONS , B. INJURIES TO PROPERTIES 5 YEARS ORDER DATED 12/12/92 IS ERRONEOUS WITHOUT MERIT SHOULD BE REVERSEDAND JUDGMENT TO HOLDING. ABUSE OF PROSECUTION.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE:

ORIGINAL PAGINATION IS NOT CONTINUOUS.

INDEX

1. QUESTIONS PRESENTED

2. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

3. OPINIONS BELOW

4. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

5. JURISDICTION

6. STATEMENT OF FACTS

7. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

8. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

9. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS

10. ARGUMENTS

11. CONCLUSION

12. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

13. APPENDIX

ABLE OF CITATIONS

. ANDERSON V HYGEIA CO. 92VA 687 ,24SE269 (1896)2yr ST L PERS INJURY

. ALMOND V KENT 321 to SUPP 1225 (1970) PROPERTY INJURY 5YR S

. ATKINS V SCHMITZ MFG CO 435 f 2d 527 (4th CIR 1970)40 2 US 992,988T 1526 1921 PERSONAL INJURY 2 YR S L

4. BIRMINGHAM V C&O RY 98VA548,376S17(1900) 2 YR ST OF L PERSONAL INJURY

5.
DILLINGHAM V. HALL 235VA 1,3, 365SE 2d738,739(1976) 2YR S O L PERS INJ

6. DREYFUS & CO V WOOTEN 23VA 42,93SE235(1918) 2YR SofL PERS INJURY.

7. FBC STORES V. DUNCAN 214VA 246 ,251, 1?98SE2d595,597(1973) 2 YR S O L PERS INJURIES.

8. GIANT OF VA V PIGG 207VA679,152SE 2d271(1983) 2YR SOL PER INJ

9. 5 YR S O L INJURY TO REPUTATION, TRADE, BUSINESS SEC18.2-499 500 FEDERATED GROPHICS CO.V. NAPOTCS 44F SUPP,291 CED VA(1976) ACTION FOR CONSPIRACY.

10. FREIDMAN V PEOPLES DRUG STORE 208VA700,160SEed563(1968) OBJECT MOTION FOR JUDGMENT NOT FOTM DETERMINES ST OF LIM

11. HINES V GRAVES 136VA313, 112SE869(1922) PERS INJ 2YR

12. JORDON V MELVILLE SHOE CO 150VA101,142SE387(1925) COMPENS DAMAGES.

13. KEEP V SHELL OIL CO 220VA587,260SE2d72(1979) INJURY TO PROPERTY CARRIES 5 YR ST OF LIM

14.
LAMBERT V. BD OF SUPR 14VA62, 124SE264(1924)

15. MIZE V HARTFORD INS CO 567FSUO 550(WOVA 1982) GUARANTEED CNST OF JURY TRIAL

16. MOORE V JEFFERSON HOSP 208VA95, 10856 2d385(1939)CMP DAM

17 NACCASH V BURGER 223VA406, 290SE2d825 (1982)

8. NEWS LEADER CO. V KOEN 173VA95,108SE2d385(1939) COMPEN DAM NO MALICE NEEDED

9. NORFOLK RY CO V SPRATLEY 130VA379,495SE502(1905)PL RECOVER NATURAL AND PROXIMATE DIR PROOF NOT NEEDED

10. SANFORD V WARD 191VA73, 605SE2d10(1950) NATURAL AND PROBABLE RESULT

11. SEALAND SERV INC. V ONEAL 224VA[illegible],297SE2d647(1982) INTENT IAL TORT NO PHYSICAL INJ COMPENS DAMAGES RECOV

12. SAFETY MOTOR TRANSIT CORP V CUNNINGHAM 10 VA356,171 432 (19 33) PERS INJ 2 YR ST OF LIM.

13. WATFORD V MORSE 202VA605, 118SE2d681(1961) PERS INF 1 YR ST OF LI.

14. MONAK V ELRIDGE 214VA338,210SE2d145(1974) RECKLESS OTR CAUS EXTRAORD EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

15. WEATHERFORD V BRITCHETT 158VA741,746 , 164SE539 (1932) PUNITIVE DAMAGES.

16. JEBB V JENKINS 194 VA704,74SE2d79(1932) PUN DAMAGES.

17 ALL CASES IN OTHER STATES AND THE FEDERAL COURTS-DISTRICT, COURT OF APPEALS , U.S. SUPREME COURT THAT ARE RELATIVE AND THOSE THAT HAVE DEALT WITH OR EXPANDED, REDEFINED THE LAWS STATUTES OR OTHERWISE THAT RELEFT THE WISDOM OR JUSTICE OF THIS CAUSE OF ACTION AND HAVE THUS CHANGED OR STRENGTHEN THE JUDGMENTS OR COMMON LAW.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
2. QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i,ii,iii
3. INDEX	iiii
4. CONTENTS	iiiii
5. TABLES OF AUTHORITIES	iiiiii
6. TABLE OF CITATIONS	iiiiiii
7.JUDGMENTS TO BE REVIEWED	2
8.JURISDICTION	2
9.CONSTITUTION ISSUES ENVOLVED	3
10 STATE STATUTE ENVOLVED	4
11 CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE CASE	5
12. SUMMARY ARGUMENTS	6
13.CONCLUSION	7
14 SIGNATURE	8
15 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	9

APPENDIX

1. NOTICE OF APPEAL	A.
2. ALL ORDERS OF SUPREME COURT OF VA.	B.
3. ALL ORDERS OF TRIAL COOURT	6
4. MOTION FOR JUDGMENT	D
5. AFFIDAVIT	E
6. DOCTORS REPORT	F

JUDGMENTS SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED ARE SET FORTH: ENTRIES;

1. SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA, FRIDAY SEPTEMBER 18th, 1992. REHEARING.

2. SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA, FRIDAY AUGUST 14th, 1992 PETITION FOR APPEAL.

3. SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA, FRIDAY AUGUST 14, 1992, DEMAND JUDGMENT ON APPEAL

4. SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA, FRIDAY AUGUST 14, 1992 DEMAND JUDGMENT OF MANDAMUS.

5. SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA, TUESDAY, MARCH 17 1992 DEMAND JUDGMENT FOR JUDGE J.E. SPRUILL TO DISQUALIFY HIMSELF BECAUSE OF BIAS, PREJUDICE, PRO DEFENDANTS, UNFAIR, DENIED JURY TRIAL. UNABLE TO GET A FAIR TRIAL.

6. CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY, NOVEMBER 13,1991.

7. CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY, DECEMBER 12,1991.

8. CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY, JANUARY 6,1992.

9. CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY, JMARCH 6, 1992.

THE STATUTE PROVISIONS AND ALL AMENDMENTS RELIED ON.

ALTHOUGH THIS CAUSE IS NOT IN THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS THE CASE IS OF SUCH PUBLIC IMPORTANCE AS TO JUSTIFY DEVIATION FROM NORMAL APPELLATE PRACTICE AND REQUIRE IMMEDIATE SETTLEMENT IN THIS COURT.

THE SUPREME COURT, THE STATE CORPORATION COURTS,

OPINIONS TO BE REVIEWED CONT,D

LOWER COURT : CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUN TY ORDERS : MARCH 6, 1992; JANUARY 6,1992; DECEMBER 12,1991 RESPECTFULLY .

OPINIONS BELOW SET FORTH WITH DATES ABOVE.

JURIEDICTION

RULE 10 OF RULES OF SUPREME COURT U.S.

CONSIDERATIOS GOVERNING REVIEW ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI :

1. A REVIEW OF CERTIORARI ON WRIT IS NOT A MATTER OF RIGHT, BUT OF JUDICIL DISCRETION ; WILL BE GRANTED . ONLY WHENTHERE ARE SPECIAL REASONS THEREOF.THE FOLLOWING N.. CONTROLLING NOR FULLY MEASURING THE COURTS DISCRETION, INDICATE THE CHARACTER OF REASONS THAT WILL BE CONSID ERED : (a) HAS RENDERED A DECISION IN CONFLICT WITH THE DECISION OF ANOTHER U.S. COURT , OR HAS DECIDED A FED ERAL QUESTION WITH A STATE COURT OF LAST RESORT; OR HAS SO FAR DEPARTED FROM THE ACCEPTED AND USUAL COURSE OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS ,OR SANCTIONED SUCH DEPARTURE BY A LOWER COURT ,AS TO CALL FOR AN EXERCISE OF THIS COU T, POWER OF SUPERVISION.

(b) WHEN A STATE COURT OF LAST RESORT HAS DECIDE D A FEDERAL QUESTION IN A WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH THE

DECISION OF ANOTHER STATE COURT OF LAST RESORT OR OF A UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS.

(c) WHEN A STATE COURT OR A UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS HAS DECIDED AN IMPORTANT QUESTION OF FEDERAL LAW WHICH HAS NOT BEEN , BUT SHOULD BE SETTLED BY THIS COURT, OR HAS DECIDED A FEDERAL QUESTION IN A WAY TH AT CONFLICTS WITH APPLICABLE DECISIONS OF THIS COURT.

MR, HOLDING INVOKES ALL OF THE HEREFORE S STIPULAT ED AND THE QUESTIONS ARE VALID AND VERY IMPORTANT, IN ALSO THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA DELIBERATE VIOLATI ONS OF THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST LAWS BY ALLOWING SUPREME COURT JUDGE LACY MAKING A QUORUM WITH, JUSTICE POFF. JUSTICE CHRISTINE . JUSTICE LACY WAS A JUDGE WITH THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF VIRGINIA FOR MANY YEARS BEFORE SHE WAS APPOINTED TO THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA, AND WORKED , SURPERVISED , INSPECTIONS FOR MANY YEARS WITH THE DEFENDANTS (RESPONDANTS) LEWIS BR OTHERS, DIRECTOR OF SECURITIES DIVISION RETAILING, MAX ZOECHLER, SUPERVISION, JOHN W. PARTRUM, CHIEF EXAMI NERS, BRIAN SILVERMAN . JUDGE LACY MADE DECISIONS IN THE ORDERS OF THE CASES BEFORE THE COURT WHICH HOLDING WAS PLANTIFF, APPELLANT, PETITIONER.

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES ENVOLVED U.S. & VIRGINIA

1. 7th AMENDMENT, US IN SUITS AT COMMON LAW, WHERE THE V[illegible] VALUE IN CONTROVERSEY SHALL EXCEED TWENTY (20) , THE RIGHT OF TRIAL BY JURY SHALL BE PRESERVED , SHALL BE OTHERWISE RE-EXAMINE IN ANY COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, THEN ACCORDINGLNG TO THE RULES OF COMMON LAW.

TRIAL BY JURY WAS REQUESTED IN THE BEGINNING IN COURT AND PLEADINGS AND ALSO DURING THE HEARING THROUGH OUT TO THE END WHILE IN THE CIRDUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY. TO NO AVAIL . THE JUDGE ADNORED THE REQUEST, WAS BIAS , PREJUDICE, PRO DEFENDANTS UNFAIR, PREVENT ING THE PLANTIFF FROM GETTING FAIR TRIAL GUARANTEED BY THE CONSTITUTION. DELIBERATE AND INTENTIONAL, KNOWN INGLY .

2. 14th AMENDMENT U.S. NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH WILL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : NOR SHALL ANY STATE DE PRIVE ANY PERSON OF LIFE, LIBERTY , OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW; NOR DENY ANY PERSON WITHIN ITS JUR IS DICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS. ALL PERSONS BORN OR NATURALIZED IN THE UNITEDSTATES AND SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION THEREOF, ARE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES AND OF THE STATE WHEREIN THEY RESIDE
THE DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS ARE ENUMERATED IN THE CASE

THE STATE STATUTES ENVOLVED

1. SEC 8.01 -243 c ode of Virginia, AMENDED A. ALL PERSONAL INJURIES , WHATEVER THE THEORY OF RECOVERY SHALL BE BROUGHT WITHIN(2) YEARS AFTER THE CAUSE OF ACTIONS SHALL ACCRUED. HOLDING BROUGHT HIS CASE 2 YEARS AFTER THE INJURY HAPPENED OR ACCRUED , ON NOVEMBER 2, 1989 THE ACTION WAS BROUGHT NOVEMBER 3, 1991 WITHIN THE STATUTE OF LIMITATION. B. EVERY ACTION FOR INJURY TO PROPERTY BE BROUGHT WITHIN 5 (15) YEARS NEXT AFTER THE CAUSE OF ACTIONS SHALL HAVE ACCRUED. PROPERTY INJURES WERE BROUGHT WITH THE PERSONAL INJURIES AGAINST THE DEFEND ANTS

2. SEC 18.2 - 499 ; 18.2- 500 CODE OF VIRGINIA AMENDED. ACTIONS FOR CONSPIRACY TO INJURE ANOTHER , REPUTATION, TRADE, BUSINESS (ES) , ESTATES, ETC. DOES SURVIVE, AND IS TIMELY BROUGHT WITHIN(5 FIVE) YEARS AFTER THE CAUSE OF ACT IONS SHALL HAVE ACCRUED . IN THIS CASE BOTH PERSONAL AND PROPERTY INJURIES WERE BROUGHT AT THE SAME TIME . LEWIS BROTHERS, JR. , MAX ZOECKLER, JOHN W. PARTHUM, BRIAN SILVERMAN , MADELINE T. WATTS DID UNEQUIVALLY CATERGORICALLY WITH NO (RESERVATIONS) OR CONCERN , DID IN COLLUSION PLAN, CONNIVE , INTENTIONALL DELIBERATELY (WITH) MALICE IN

A COMSPIRACY TO PRODUCE UPON MR. HOLDING PERSONAL AND DID INFLICT IN
JURIES AND INJURIES TO HIS BUSINESSES, HIS ESTATES,
HIS TRADE, HIS REPUTATION which is UNBLEMISHED OF IMPECCABLE
INTEGRITY FOR 71 YEARS , INTERNATIONALLY, PROFESSIONS,
FAMILIES, MEMBER IN THE COMMUNITY IN VIRGINIA AND THE
WORLD , HIS FRIENDS,ASSOCIATES,OWNER OF A BROKERAGE SEC
URITIES FIRM AND MANAGEMENT . MR HOLDING WAS ~~INFLICTED WITH~~ THESE PERSONAL INJURIES
AND INJURIES TO PROPERTIES, REPUTATION ARE PERMANENT
IRREPARABLE AND I EMPHASIZE CAN NEVER BE CURED OR RE
PAIRED WHICH HAS DESTROYED HIS INTEGRITY, HIS BUSINESSES,
HIS REPUTATION , CHARACTER(SPOTLESS) AND FOR OF FORTY THREE
YEARS WITHOUT ONE SINGLE COMPLAINT AND MR. HOLDING
PAID THE PRICE FOR SUCH AN OUTSTANDING INTEGRITY,
CHARACTER, REPUTATION WHICH WAS DESTROYED BY THE
DEFENDANTS WHO ARE HAPPY AND WHO REJOICE BY THE PERSONAL
INJURIES AND INJURIES TO HIS BUSINESSES, PROPERT
IES, ESTATES, REPUTATION , AND TRADES. IT IS THE INFKICTED ON MR. HOLDING
MOST HEINOUS CRIME ANYONE CAN AND WOULD PERPERTRATE ON AN
OTHER AND THEN BRAGG ABOUT IT WITH BRAZEN ARROGEN
CY; THEN BE CONDONED, APPROVED, SUPPORTED, APPROVED
BY THE JUDGE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND
COUNTY AND THE JUDGES OF THE VIRGINIA SUPREME COURT.
THESE COURTS ARE THE MOST CORRUPT COURTS IN THE COUNTRY
WITH NO CONSCIENCE OR REGRETS OR CONCERN, NO INTEGRITY.

3. SEC 8.01-271.1 EVERY PLEADING WRITTEN, AND OTHER REPRESENTED PAPER OF A PARTY/BY AN ATTORNEY SHALL BE SIGNED BY AT LEAST ONE ATTORNEY OF RECORD IN HIS INDIVIDUAL NAME , AND THE ATTORNEY,S ADDRESS SHALL BE STATED ON THE FIRST PLEADING FILED BY THAT ATTORNEY IN THE ACTION, A PARTY WHO IS NOT REPRESENTED BY AN ATTORNEY SHALL SIGN HIS PLEADING, MOTION, OTHER PAPER AND STATE HIS ADDRESS.

THE SIGNATURE OF AN ATTORNEY OR PARTY CONSTITUTES A CERTIFICATE BY HIM1THAT HE HAS READ THE PLEADING, MOTION ,OR OTHER PAPER,ii TO THE BEST OF HIS KNOWLEDGE ,INFORMATION, AND BELIEF, FORMED AFTER REASONABLE INQUIRY IT IS WELL GROUNDED IN FACT AND IS WARRANTED BY EXISTING LAW OR A GOOD FAITH ARGUMENT FORTH EXTENSION , MODIFI CATION , OR REVERSAL OF EXISTING LAW, AND(iii) IT ISH NOT INTERPOSED FOREATY IMPROPER PURPOSE, SUCH AS TO HARASS OR TO CAUSE UNNECESSARY DELAY OR NEEDLESS INCREASE IN THE COST OF LITIGATION ,IF A PLEADING, WRITTEN MOTION, OR OTHER PAPER IS NOT SIGNED, IT SHALL BE STRICKEN UNLESS SIGNED PROMPTLY AFTER THE OMMISSION IS CALLED TO THE ATTENTION OF THE PLEADER OR MOVANT.

ORDER"DATED 12/12/91 GAVE WATTS $250 AS VIOLATION OF SEC OF 8.01-271.1 BY WARE PLEADING A BOLD FACE LYE USING THIS STATUTE ON HOLDING,S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AND AFF IDAVIT WHEN FIRST FILED ON 2/3/91/(MART 3,1991) WHEN MR HOLDING HAS HAD 43 YEARS WITH THE LAW. IMPOSSIBLE. WARE SHOULD BE DISBARRED FOR SUCH A LIE AND MISCONDUCT • CASES IN SUPPORT SANCTIONS AGAINST ATTORNEY REVERSED TULLIDGE V SUPVR (BD) OF 239VA611,391SE2D1288(1990) ; COUNTY PRINCE WILLIAM V RAU 239VA616,3912d 290(1990) TR CT ERROR

PETITION FOR CERTIORARI

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IN

WASHINGTON, D.C.

PETITIONER, CLARENCE H. HOLDIND dba CLARENCE H. HOLDING & COMPANY RESPECTFULLY PRAYS IN THE INTEREST OF THE WELFARE AND IN RESPECT FOR THE 43 YEARS OWNER AND OPERATOR OF A BROKERAGE SECURITIES FIRM IN VIRGINIA AND NORTH CAROLINA, REAL ESTATE AND OTHER BUSINESSES BY CLARENCE H. HOLDING AND JUSTICE , THAT A WRIT OF CERTIORARI BE FORTH COMMING TO REVIEW AND NEEDS THE ATTENTION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN WASHINGTON , THE CAPITOL.

THE OPINIONSAND JUDGMENTS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA : FRIDAY SEPTEMBER 18th , 1992 REHEARING PETITION. FRIDAY AUGUST 14,1992. APPEAL PETITION. FRIDAY AUGUST 14th DEMAND JUDGMENT. 1992 . FRIDAY AUGUST 14,1992 DEMAND JUDGMENT ON MANDAMUS. MARCH 17th TUESDAY 1992 DEMAND JUDGMENT FOR JUDGE J.E. SPRUILL TO DISQUALIFY

A CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE CASE

ON MARCH 12, 1992 CLARENCE H. HOLDING FILED WITH CHIEF JUSTICE CARRICO OF THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA A MOTION TO DISQUALIFY JUDGE J.E. SPRUILL JR. FROM PARTICIPATIND IN THE ABOVE CAPTIONED CASE, BECAUSE HE HAD MADE ERRONEOUS DECISIONS, WAS UNFAIR , WAS PREJUDICE, WAS BIAS , PRO DEFENDANTS AND TOTALLY UNFIT TO HEAR THE CASE AND DEMANDED HE APPOINT A NEUTRAL JUDGE WHO WOULD ALLOW A JURY TRIAL WHICH WAS REFUSED BY JUDGE SPRUILL. JUDGE CARRICO DENIED THE SAID "THE MOTION".

ON JULY 29,1992, AND AGAIN JULY 30, 1992 JUSTICE CHRISTINE, JUSTICE POFF, JUSTICE ELIZABETH LACY SITTING IN QUORUM, JUDGE CHRISTINE PRESIDING IN CHARGE MADE DECISIONS AGAINST MR. HOLDING WITH THE ORDERS ISSUED ON AUGUST 14,1992

THESE ORDERS ARE :

UPON A PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO COMPEL JUDGE SPRUILL TO SIGN THE STATEMENT OF FACTS OF THE CASR AND PRESSENT IT TO THE COURT FOR RECORD, THE COURT IS OF THE APINION THAT A WRIT OF MANDAMUS SHOULD NOT ISSUE AS PRAYED FOR. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT THE MANDAMUS BE DISMISSED. AND THE THE JUDGE RECOVER THE COSTS BY HIM EXPENDED ABOUT HIS DE DEFENSE. THE ORDER ISSUED AUGUST 14,1992.

ALL THESE CASE WERE BECAUSE OF JUSTICE LACY PARTICIPATING IN THE DECISIONS HEREWITH , MR . HOLDING PETITIONED

THE COURT FOR DEMAND JUDGMENT. ON AUGUST 10,1992 CAME THE THE PETITIONER IN PROPER PERSON , AND FILED A DEMAND JUDGME NT IN THE CASE AFTER LEARNING JUSTICE WAS PARTICIPATING IN THE DEDISIONS BECAUSE SHE HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. JUDGE LACY WAS A JUDGE AT THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF VIRGINIA. THE DEFENDANTS ARE MEMBERS OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION FOR SOME TIME AND ASSOCIATED WITH JUDGE LACY BEFORE SHE CAME TO THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA ABOUT TWO YEARS AGO .

THEREFORE JSUTICE LACY CAUSES A CONFLICT OF INTEREST , AND SHE KNOWINGLY AND WITH THE KNOWLEDGE OF JUSTICE POFF AND JUSTICE CHRISTINE AND THEIR CONSENT AND APPROVAL MAKES THE CASES SET FORTH HERE NULL AND VOID BECAUSE OF COMFLICT OF INTEREST AND FURTHERMORE VIOLATED MR. HOLDING,S CONSTITUT IONAL RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS GUARANTEED BT THE 14th AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND ALSO THE VA CONSTITUTION .

order made AUGUST 14,1992.

UPON REVIEW OF THE RECORD IN THIS CASE AND CONSIDERATION OF ARGUMENTS SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF AND ITS OPPOSTTION TO THE GRANTING OF AN APPEAL , THE COURT IS PF THE OPONION THE RE IS NO REVERSIBLE ERROR IN THE JUDGMENT COMPLAINED OF. COURT REFUSES THE PETITION OF APPEAL . JUDGE LACY PARTICI PATED IN THEDECISION OF AUGUST 14,1992, THEREFORE IS VOID. CONFLICT OF INTEREST .

CLARENCE H. HOLDING, CLARENCE H. HOLDING & COMOANY A BROKERAGE SECURITIES FIRM FOR THE PAST 43 YEARS BY COUNSU EL @RO SE FILED @N SEPTEMBER 3 , 1991 MOTION FOR JUDG MENT FOR DAMAGES , PERSONAL INJURIES &PERSONAL INJURIES TO HIS PROPERTYS, HIS BUSINESSES, TRADE, HIS ESTATES, HIS PERSONALTY AGAINST LEWIS BROTHERS, JR., MAX ZEICKLER, JOHN W. PARTHUM, BRIAN SILVERMAN , MADELINE D. WATTS FOR $10,000,000, COMPENSATORY DAMAGES FROM EACH DEFENDANT , AND $10,000,000 PUNITIVE DAMAGES TRIPLED PUNITIVE DAMAGES FROM EACH DEFENDANT .

THE CASE WAS FILED UNDER VA STATUTE Sec 8@01-243 AND SEC 18.2-499 & 500 AS AMENDED FOR CONSPIRACY OF THE DEF ENDANTS. THE EVENT HAPPENED ON SEPTEMBER 2, 1989 AT THE HOME OF MR. HOLDING , MOUNT PLEASANT , HAGUE , VA. IN WESTMORELAND COUNTY.

STATUTE 8.01-243 OF THE CODE OF VA AMNEDED STATES: A. EVERY ACTION FOR PERSONAL INJURIES WHATSOEVER THE THEORY OF RECORVERY, SHALL BE BROUGHT WITHIN TWO YEARS AFTER THE CAUSE OF ACTION SHALL HAVE ACCRUED. B. EVEN ACTION FOR INJURY TO PROPERTY MUST BE BROUGHT WITHIN 5YEARS AFTER NEXT THE CAUSE OF ACTION SHALL HAVE ACCRUED.

THE PERSONAL INJURIES AND INJURIES TO PROPERTES OCC URRED ON SEPTEMBER 2, 1989 OF MR. HOLDING,S . THE ACTION WAS BROUGHT ON SEPTEMBER 3, 1991 , WELL WITHIN THE STATUTE OF SEC 8.01@243 OF THE CODE .

THE ORIGINAL ACTION OF CONSPIRACY OF LEWIS BROTHERS, MAX ZEOCMLER , JOHN W. PARTHUM, BRIAN SILVERMAN , AND

[illegible] T

MADELINE T. WATTS WAS BROUGHT ON SEPTEMBER 3, 1991 . THE PERSONAL INJURIES AND THE INJURIES TO PROPERTIES, ESTATES, PERSONALTY , TRADES WERE BROUGHT AS A RESULT OF THE CONSPIR.. ACY THAT BROUGHT PERSONAL INJURIES AND INJURIES TO HIS PRO PERTIES, ESTATES, BURINESSES, TRADE PERSOBALTY AND SUSTAI NED BY MR. HOLDING WHICH ARE PERMANENT , IRREPARABLE AND CAN NEVER BE FIXED OR CURED IN THE FUTURE. MR. HOLDING HAS SUFFEREDAND SUSTAINED OF HIS HEART TROUBLE, CHEST PAINS , ANGINA, OTHE SUFFERINGS, GREAT SUFFERINGS AND AGGRAVATION.

JURY TRIAL WAS DENIED ALTHOUGH IT WAS DEMANDED FROM THE BEGINNING , IN PERSON ,IN COURT , BY PLEADINGS.

NO WITNESSES WERE ALLOWRD . MR. HOLDING THOUGH REQUEST ED SAME. NOE EVIDENCE WAS TAKEN OR GIVEN OR ALLOWED. NO STATEMENTS WERE GIVEN BY ANY WITNESSES AS TO THE FACTURAL ISSUES OF THE CASE, NONE WERE ALLOWED. THE DECISIONS W ERE REACHED BY THE COURT WAS BASED UPON THE PLEADINGS, MOTIONS OBJECTIONS BY THE PARTIES OF THE CASE. THERE HAVE BEEN NO COUNSELS FACT FINDING HEARINGS , WHICH WOULD HAVE ESTABLISHED THE TRUTH OF THE CASE.

MR. HOLDING DEMANDS BY NOT LETTING THE WITNESSES BOTH THE DEFENDANTS AND COMMON WEALTH ATTORNEY AND LIEUTENANT CLARK OF THE ESSEX SHERIFF DEPT. BECAUSE OF THEIR DIRECT PARTICIPATION IN THE CASE AGAINST MR. HOLDING ,IF PERMITTED TO TESTIFY AND CROSS EXAMINED WOULFD HAVE MADE A STRONG AFFIRMATIVE DIFFERENCE IN THE OUTCOME OF THE CASE.

BOTH IN THE CIRCUIT COURT AND THE SUPREME COURT OF VA. JUDGE SPRUILL WAS IN A HURRY TO DENY MR. HOLDING JUSTICE AND DAMAGES. THE JUDGE IS 100 % predjuice, bias, pro defend ANYS UNFAIR , OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE WHICH IS DIRECT VIO LATION OF THE DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OF MR. HOLDING . .

MR. HOLDING SEEING WHAT WAS GOING ON, TO PROTECT HIS INTERESTS DEMANDED JUDGE SPRUILL DISQUALIFY HIMSELF AND APPOINT A NEUTRAL JUDGE TO HEAR THE CASE. THE JUDGE RE FUSED.

MR. HOLDING PETITIONED CHIEF JUSTICE CARRICO TO DIS QUALIFY JUDGE SPRUIALL AND APPOINT A NEUTRAL JUDGE TO HEAR THE CASE. JUDGE CARRICAO REFUSED.

JUDGE SPRUILL REFUSED TO SIGN THE STATEMENT OF FACTS OF IHE CASE FOR THE RECORD. MR. HOLDING PETITIONED THE SUPREME COURT BY MANDAMUS . SC. REFUSED .

JUSTICE ELIZABETH LACY, JUDGE POFF, JUDGE CHRISTINE RULED ON THE APPEAL , AND 4 OTHER CASES IN THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA WHILE JUDGE LACY CAUSED A CONFLIT OF INTEREST IN HER PARTISIPATION IN THE 5 CASES BEFORE THE COURT. JUDGE LACY WAS ASSOCIATED WITH THE DEFENDANTS IN THE STATE CORP ORATION COMMISSION OF VA. WHILE SHE WAS JUDGE THERE, BEFOR E COMMING TO THE SUPREME COURT OF VA ABOUT 2 TO 3 YEARS AGO. THUS MAKING IT A CONFLICT OF INTEREST BECAUSE OF IT. ILLEGAL

FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY . ON AUGUST 10,1992 CAME THE APPELLANT , IN PROPER PERSON FIL ED A PLEADING ENTITLRD "DEMAND JUDGMENT IN THE ABOVE STYL ED CASE AND DEMANDED JUDGMENT BECAUSE OF JUDGE LACY CONFLICT IN THE CASE AND WITH FULL KNOWLEDGE BY HER AND JUSTICE POFF AND JUSTICE CHRISTINE WHO RENDERED THIS DECISION AND ORDER ON AUGUST 14,1992. DENIED.

UPON PETITION FOR REHEARING OF THE APPELLANT TO SET AS IDE THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURTRENDERED ON AUGUST 14,1992 ON THE CASE ITSELF AND GRANT A REHEARING , THE PRAYER IS OF THE PETITITION IS DENIED . MR HOLDING SAYS THE DECESION SO ORDERED BECAUSE OF THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST OF JUSTICE LACY WITH FULL KNOWLEDGE SHE WAS IN CONFLICT AND JUSTICE CHRISTINE AND JUSTICE POFF WHO HAD KNOWLEDGE OF IT AND CON DONED MAKES THE ORDERS NULL AND VOID WHICH VIOLATED THE DUR PROCESS RIGHTS OF MR.HOHDING.ORDER RENDERED SEPTEMBER 18,1992, MAKES IT NULL AND VOID BECAUSE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OF MR. HOLDING.

THE CIRCUIT COURTS, THE GENERAL DISTRICT COURTS ARE ALL CORRUPT. THEY ARE INDEED VERY OPEN AND BRAZEN WITH THEIR IMJUSTICE AND LACKING IN MORAL , INTEGRITY, RESPECT . PEOPLE ARE UNABLE TO GET A FAIR TRAIL FOR THE JUDGES, THEY ARE BIASE, ARE PREJUDICE, UNFIT TO SIT ON THE BENCHES OF THE COURTS, HAVE NO DIGNTY AND OR RESPECT FOR THE THE COURTS AND INTEGRITY , THEY ARE ABOVE THE LAWS AND CONSTITUTIONS , POWER UNTO THEMSELVES AND CONDONE AND SUPPORT, PROTECT EACH OTHER. I DEMAND A COMPLETE INVESTIGATION OF THE COURT SYSTEM BY AN INDEPENDANT. NEUTRAL COMMISSION WITH IN TEGRITY, RESPECT AND JUSTICE FOR INDIVIDUALS AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF VIRGINI AND THE U.S. CONSTITUTION . RE STORE , LIBERTY, JUSTICE, INDIVIDUAL PURSUIT OF HAPPIN ESS , DUE PROCESS OF ALL UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONS , LAWS OF THE LAND. WE CAN NOT CONTINUE WITH THIS CORRUPTION, AND INJUSTICE. TIME WILL CORRECT IT ONE WAY OR ANOTHER. HISTORY AND THE BIBLE REVEALS THE TRUTH:. IT IS TIME PAST.

SUMMARY ARGUMENTS OF THE CASE

UNEQUIVICABLE AND CATOGORICALLY JURY TRIAL WAS DENIED . WHICH IS A DIRECT VIOLATION OF THE RIGHTS GUARANTEED BY THE 7TH AMENDMENT OF THE US.CONSTITUTION WITH NO RESERVAT ION.WHICH IS SUBJECT TO JUDGMENT AT LEAST A NEW TRIAL.

THERE WAS CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA .MR. HOLDING FOUND AND CALLED ATTENTION TO THE SUPREME COURT THERE WAS A DEFINITE COMIT OF INTEREST WITH JUDGE LACY SITTING OF THE BENCH IN THIS CASE, JUDGE LACY WAS STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION JUDGE BEFORE COMM ING TO THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA RECENTLY. AT THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION JUDGE LACY WAS ASSOCIATED WITH THE DEFEMDAMTS BROTHERS, ZOECKLER, PARTHUM , SILVERMAN IN THE SECURITIES DIVISION AND FRANSCHISE DEPT. AND WORKED WITH DAILY. THE COURT WAS INFORMED BY HOLDING ON JULY AND 29, 30 ,1992 AT HEARINGS.. THE COURT MADE 5 DECISIONS OF HOLDING ,S JUSTICE POFF AND JUDGE CHRI STINE MADE THE QUORUM OF THE COURT WITH JUDGE LACY . AFTER BEING INFORMED STILL JUDGE LACY CONTINUED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ORDERS.JUDGE CHRISTIAN AND JUDGE POFF AFTER BEING IMFORMED ARE ACCOMPLSHERS . THE 5 ORDERS WERE ISSUED ON AUGUST 14, 1992. . BECAUSE OF THIS VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS RIGHTS SUBJECT TO JUDGMENT OR NEW TRIAL .

IN VIOLATION OF STATUTE SEC 18.2-1499 AND SEC"18.2-500)F THE CODE OF VA./DID AND WAS VIOLATED BY LEWIS BROTHERS, JR., MAX ZOECKLER, JOHN W. PARTHUM, BRIAN SILVERMAN, MADELINE T. WATTS TOGETHER , PLANNED , CONNIVED , IN COLUSION AFTER INTENTIONALLY, WANTONLY , WILFULLY/ DID CAUSE PERSONAL INJURIES AND IJURIES TO HIS BURINESSES, ESTATE, PROPERTIES WHILE MR. HOLDING WAS IN THE HOSPITAL WITH CHEST PAINS , ANGINA, STRANGLING ACUTE HERNIA OPERATION. THE DEFENDANTS WERE JOYFUL, BRAGGED AB OUT IT , GOTTA LOT OF KICKS OUT OFT OF IT, VERY BRAZEN ABOUT IT, WENT DOWN TO ESSEX COURT HOUSE CONTACTED GARRETT THE COMMONWEALTHATTORNEY AND LIEUTENTANT CLRK OF THE SHERIFF DEPARTMENT AND PERSUADED THE COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY AND THE LIEUTENANT CLARK TO SWEAR OUT A WARRANT FOR MR. HOLDING,S ARREST FOR EMBEZZLING A CHECK FOR $10,000 . MR. HOLDING WAS ARRESTED AT HIS HOME THE DAY HE RETURNED FROM THE HOSP ITAL ON SEPTEMBER 2, 1989 .

JUDGE HYDE DISMISSED THE FALSE CHARGE ON JANUARY 11,1990 ON RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY IN THE GENERAL DISTRICT COURT.

TRIAL JUDGE REFUSAL TO GRANT A JURY TRIALCOUPLED WITH THE FACT HE PROVED HE WAS BIASE , PREJUDICE, PRO DEFENDANTS. REFUSAL TO ACCEPT THE STATEMENT OF FACTS OF THE CASE, SIGB PRESENT TO AND INCLUDE WITH THE RECORD FOR SUPREME COURT EVEN MANDAMUS FAILED TO GET THE STATEMENT SIGN OR PERFECTED.

THERE WERE NO FACT FINDING PROBES. THERE WERENO DEFENDANT S AVAILABLE TO TESTIFY AND BE EXAMINED BY HOLDING. NO EVIDENCE WAS TAKEN , GIVEN, ALLOWED , NO STATEMENTS AS TO THE FACTOR AL ISSUES OF THE CASE. NO HEARINGS ON FACT FINGIND ALLOWED.
OF THE COURT
THE DECISIONS WERE MADE SOLEY ENTIRELY WERE BASED UPON PL EADINGS , MOTIONS, OBJECTIONS BY THE PARTIES, WHICH WERE OF NO VALUE SINCE THE JUDGE ABSOLUTELY ADNORED THE MANY MOT IONS, PLEADINGS OF HOLDING. THIS PRESENTS REASON FOR JUDG MENT FOR HOLDING.

THE VIOLATION OF 18,2-499&500 STATUTE ON CONSPIRACY WHICH CARRIES A FIVE YEAR STATUTION OF LIMITATIONS WAS ADNORED BY THE TRIAL JUDGE WHEN CONSPIRACY OF THE DEFENDANT S IS A GREAT OART OF THE CASE AND NEEDS TO BE HEARD FOR A ADUDICATION OF THIS CASE AND MR. HOLDINGS CONSTITUTION AL RIGHTS PROTECTED AND SAVED. THIS IS ACTUALLY THE BASIS OF THIS CASE.

MIS
THERE WAS GREAT USE OFSTATUTE 8.01-271.1in pleadings of john ware counsuel for Madelibe Watts . ACTUALLY WARE LIED PROFUSELY AND WAS CONDONED AND REWARDS BY THE LYING

SEC 8.01-271.1 CONT.D CIRCCUIT COURT ORDER DATE 3/6/92

WARE, JOHNSON COUNSEL LIED AGAIN AND PLEADED SEC 8.01-271.1

IN A HEARING WHEN THE STATEMENT OF THE CASE WAS PRESENT

ED TO THE CIRCUIT COURT . WARE SHOULD BE DISBARRED FOR

LYING AND FINED $5,000, YET WATTS WAS AWARDED $500 . A

SHAM AND DISGRACE BY THE JUDGE FOR CONDONING THE LIAR AND AWARDING HIM FOR IT

JUDGE DID NOT EVEN READ THE STATEMENT OF CASE OR APPROVE

OR DISAPPROVE IT OR TRY TO COME ABOUT A STATEMENT THAT WOUL

LD BE ACCEPTED AND ADD TO THE RECO RD. . YOU HAVE A LYING

ATTORNEY AND A CORRUPT JUDGE, WHO IS BIAS , PREJUDJICE, UN

FAIR , UNCONSTITUTIONAL , LACK OF INTEGRITY, PARTIAL, VIND

ICTIVE, IMHUMAN.· IT IS A SHAM TO GET THIS KIND OF JUSTICE

WHEN MR. HOLDING HAS BEEN DRALING WITH THE LAW FOR 43 YEARS

IT IS A SHAME AND AN OUTRIGHT CRIME FOR THE JUSTICE THE

JUDGE IS DISPENSING WITH ,THIS CONDITION MUST BE CORRECTED

AND THOSE WHO ARE PARTICIAPATING IN THE INJUSTICE SHOULD

BE DISBARRED, PUNISHED, FINED AND IMPRIS ONED FOR 25 YEARS.

IT IS TIMENOW OR TIME WILL CORREST IT FOR US.HISTORY AND

THE BIBLE REVEALS TO US HOW IT WORKS AND HOW IT WILL WORKS. JUSTICE

CIVILIZATION CANNOT PUT UP AND INDURE/OR SUPPORT THIS KIND OF JUSTICE.

IT SHOULD NOT BE THIS WAY AND PEOPLE ARE GETTING TIRED

OF THE UNJUSTICE EXISTING . IT MUST BE CURED SO PEOPPLE

CAN LIVE IN JUSTICE AND HAPPY IN THEIR LIFE WITH PEACE.

AND ABUSE OF PROCESS
BY THE TRIAL JUDGE IN ORDERS 12/12/91; 1/6 /92, 3.6.92 in WHICH THE TRIAL JUDGE AWARDED SANCTIONS OF $259 AND $ 500 FOR LYING TO HIS CLIENT WATTS, THIS IS THE MOST UNREASON ABLE MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE THAT COULD BE POSS IBLE. RE WARDING A COUNSEL FOR LYING AT THE EXPENSE OF MR. HOLDING. THE TWO INCIDENTS OF THE AWARDS WERE HOLDING,S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AND AFFIDAVIT IN BEGINNING AND STATEMENT OF THE CASE THE JUDGE NEVER READ.

MR. HOLDING HAS 43 YEARS WORK WITH THE LAW , IT IS PREPOSTEROUS TO THINK HOLDING COULD BE SO STUPID AS TO SUBMIT PLEADING SO IMPORTANT AS THESE WERE. IT IS AN INSULT TO HIS INTELLIGENCE. THESE PLEADINGS OF JOHN WARE ARE A DIRECT VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AND IS SUBJECT TO JUDGMENT , DISMISSAL AND DAMAGES.

R. MCKENNEY COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS , BROTHERS ET AL ABSOLUTE LYING IN WRITING THE ORDERS IS A DISGRACE TO MR HOLDING AND THE COURT. SUBJECT TO JUDGMENT , REVERSAL AND DAMAGES.

DIRECT VIOLATION OF SEC 8.01-243 OF THE CODE OF VA AMENDED IS THE CORRECT STATUTE FOR PERSONAL INJURIES AND INJURIES TO PROPER TIES WHICH CARRIES 2 YEARS FOR PERSONAL INJURIES AND 5 YEARS FOR INJURIES TO PROPERTY .

MR. HOLDING IS WELL EDUCATED WIRH A B.S. DEGREE, LAW 5 DEGREES IN FINANCE AN D ECONOMICS, GOVERNMENT, INVESTMEN

IMPECCABLE INTEGRITY, CHARACTER, PERSONALTY, HONOR, FOR 72 YEARS, WITH 43 YEARS OWNER AND OPERATOR OF A BROKERAGE FIRM IN VIRGINIA AND NORTH CAROLINA WITHOUT A SINGLE COM PLAINT.

MR. HOLDING HAS BEEN UNMERICIFULLY , SUBSTANTIALLY IRREPARABLY , PERMANENTLY DAMAGEED BY THE INTENTIONAL , DIRECT, SCURRILIOUS , UNPROVOKED, ACTS OF THE DEFENDANTS. THESE ACTS HAVE CAUSED PERSONAL INJURIES UNTOLD AND IN JURIES TO PROPERTIES, BUSINESSES, ESTATES , CHARACTER, PERSONALTY, EMBBARRASSMENT , MENTAL ANQUISH WITH NO RE MORSE OR CONCERN OF THE DEFENDANTS .

ALL THESE PERSONAL AND PROPERTIES INJURIES ARE PER MANENT, INCUREABLE,CANNOT BE FIXED AND HAS CAUSED MR. HOLDING SURMOUNTABLE SUFFERINGS AND DAMAGES AND INJURIES WHICH HAS DESTROYED 72 YEARS OF HARD WORK AND INPECCABLE IN TEGRTY, PROFESSIONS, BUSINESSES, ESTATES AND SHOULD BE COMPENSATED .

CONCLUSION

THE PETITION SHOULD DEFINITELY BE ISSUED SO THE ENDS OF JUSTICE CAN BE MAINTAINED AND SURVIVE WITH DAMAGES AND JUDGMENT TO MR. HOLDING FOR THE WRONGS BESTOWED UP ON WITH THE SUFFERINGS ENDURED THE INJURIES (PERSONAL) AND INJURIES TO HIS BUSINESSES , ESTATES , PROPERTIES, HIS CHARACTER, PERSONALTY, MENTAL SUFFERING , INJURIES TO HIS NEIGHBORS IN THE COMUNITY , IN THE STATE , IN THE WORL THE WORLD TO HIS SECURITIES BROKERAGE FIRM .

ALL THESE PERSONAL INJURIES AND INJURIES TO PROPERTIES BUSINESS, ESTATE, CHARACTER, HIS IMPECCABLE INTEGRITY FOR 43 /71 YEARS LIFE 43 YEARS INHIS BUSINESS WITH NOT ONE COMPLAINT. ALL OF THESE INJURIES ARE IRREPARABLE, PERMANENNT , AND CAN NEVER BE REPAIRED OR CURED.

YES THE PETITION SHOULD BE HONORED AND JUDGMENT AND D. DAMAGES GRANTED AND AWARDED ASK FOR .

Clarence Houston Holding

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Clarence Houston Holding

CLARENCE HOUSTON HOLDING
ROUTE 1 BOX 2
MOUNT PLEASANT PLANTATION
HAGUE, VIRGINIA 22469
(804) 472 2026
COUNSEL FOR APPELLANT PRO SE

CLARENCE H.OUSTON HOLDING
FOR CLARENCE H. HOLDING
COUNSEL PRO SE.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY I SENT ist CLASS MAIL POSTAGE PAID OPIES TO THE COUNSELS OF THE APPELLEES. ON DECEMBER 16, 1992.

Clarence Houston Holding

CLARENCE HOUSTON HOLDING

7,8,9

APPENDIX

PRAMOD K.MOHANEY, M.D. FACC,FACP
PROFESSOR OF MEDICINE(CARDIOLOGY
MEDIACAL COLLEGE/VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF INTERNAL MEDICINE
BOX 282, MCV STATION, RICHMOND, VA 23298

NOVEMBER,13,1992

DEAR SIR/MADAM:

THIS LETTER IS TO CERTIFY THAT CLARENCE H.HOLDING(SS#238-16
5011 IS A 72 YEAR OLD WHITE MALE WHO IS FOLLOWED BY THE CARD
IOLOGY CLINIC AT THE HOLMES HUNTER MCGUIRE V.A. MEDICAL CEN
TER FOR THE FOLLOWING PROBLEMS:

(1) DEGENERATIVE BILATERAL HIP JOINT
(2) HPERLIPIDENNIA
(3) SEVERE CERVICAL SPONDLOSIS PARR SYNDRONNE
(4) THEROSCLEROTIC CORONARY ARTERY DISEASE,SEVERE MUL
TI*VESSEL S/P CABG 1977 AND 1985, ANGINA PECTORIS C
CLASS III.

IN VIEW FO THE SEVERR DISABLING CARDIAC AND DEGENERATIVE JO
INT DISEASE(WITH LIMITED MOBILITY) HE IS CONSIDERED PERMANE
NTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED,

SINCERELY,

SIGNED,P.M, MOHANTY
PRAMOD K. MOHANTY, M.D.
CHIEF,CARDIOLOGY SECTION
MCGUIRE V.A. MEDICAL CENTER

DIRECTOR, HEART FAILURE-HEART TRANSPLANT PROGRAM(MCV/VA)

CARDIOLOGY DIVISION (iiiJ)
V.A. MEDICAL CENTER
RICHMOND, VA 23249
(804) 230-1341

CARDIOLOGY DIVISION
MCV BOX 282
RICHMOND, VA 23298
(8040 371 7316
(804) 225-4571

V I R G I N I A

IN THE SUPREME COURT AT RICHMOND

CLARENCE H. HOLDIND, CLARENCE H. HOLDING & COMPANY,
APPELLANT,

V RECORD #920336
CIR CT # 91-69

LEWIS BROTHERS, JR., MAX ZOECKLER, JOHN W. PARTHUM, BRI
AN SILVERMAN, MADELINE T, WATTS, APPELLEES.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

COMES NOW CLARENCE H. HOLDING, CLARENCE H. HOLDING & COMPANY BY COUNSEL PROSE AND GIVES FORTH VIRGOROUSLY HIS NOTICE OF FERMLY APPEAL OF ORDERS FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA AS FOLLOWS: PURSUANT TO RULE 5:41 of rules OF OF SUPREME COURT OF VA. 1950 AMENDED . AS DIRECTED

AUGUST 14,1992 CLARENCE H. HOLDING, CLARENCE H. HOLDI NG, APPELLANT V LEWIS BROTHERS, JR., MAX ZOECKLER, JOHN W. PARTHUM, BRIAN SILVERMAN, MADELINE T. WATTS, APPELLEES RECORD 920336,CIR CT # 91-69 NO REVERSIBLE ERROR.

AUGUST 14.1992 CLARENCE H. HOLDING, CLARENCE H. HOLDING AND COMPANY V. LEWIS BROTHERS, JR. , MAX ZOECKLER, JOHN W. PARTHUM, BRIAN SILVERMAN, MADELINE T. WATTS. RECORD 920336 CIR CT. # 91-69. " DEMAND JUDGMENT".

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF U.S.A.

DEMAND THE CLERK PREPARE THE RECORD, HOLD, SEND FORTH THE RECORD TO THE SUPREME COURT OF U.S.A. WASHINGTON , D.C. HOLD UNTIL PROCEEDING IN THE SUPREME COURT OF U.S.A. TERMINATED.

SIGNED
CLARENCE HOUSTON HOLDING
ROUTE 1 BOX 2
MOUNT PLEASANT PLANTATION
HAGUE, VA. 22469
(804) 472 2026
COUNSEL FOR APPELLANT PROSE

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
SIGNED
CLARENCE HOUSTON HOLDING,
COUSEL FOR APPELLANT PRO SE.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY I SENT A COPY TO COUNSELS OF THE APPELLEES 8/20/92.
SIGNED
CLARENCE HOUSTON HOLDING

V I R G I N I A

IN THE SUPREME COURT RICHMOND

CLARENCE H. HOLDING , CLARENCE H. HOLDING COMPANY,
APPELLANT,

V. RECORD 920336
CIR CT 91-69

LEWIS BROTHERS, JR. MAX ZOECKLER, JOHN W. PARTHUM , BRIAN SILVERMAN. MADELINE T. WATTS, APPELLEES.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

COMES NOW CLARENCE H. HOLDIN, CLARENCE H. HOLDING & COMPAMY BY COUNSEL PRO SE GIVES FORTH VIGOROUSLY NOTICEOF FIRMLY APPEAL TIMELY OF ORDERS FROM SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA PURSUANT TO RULE [illegible] RULES OF SUPREME COURT OF VA. AS AMENDED 1950.

AUGUST 14,1992 CLARENCE H. HOLDING, CLARENCE H. HOLDING & COMPANY IN RE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AGAINST THE JUDGE OF CIRCUIT CT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY, VA

AUGUST 14, 1992 CLARENCE H. HODDING, CLARENCE H. HOLDING & COMPANY. IN RE PETITION FOR DEMAND JUDGMENT ON THE WRIT OF MANDAMUS.

MARCH 12,1992 IN PROPER PERSON MOTION TO CHIEF JUSTICE DARRICOTO DISQUALIFY JUDGE J.E. SPRUILL, JR AND TO REPLACE HIM WITH A NEUTRAL JUDGE TO HEAR THE CASE BECAUSE OF BIAS PREHUDICE, UNFAIR , PRO DEFENDANT .

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF U.S. OF AMERICA .

DEMAND THE CLERK PREARE THE RECORD, HOLD ,SEND FORTH THE RECORD TO THE SUPREME COURT OF U.S.OF AMERICA IN WASHINGTON,D.C.HOLD UNTIL THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE U.S. SUPREME CORT OF AMERICA DIRECTS OR TERMINATED.

SIGNED
CLARENCE HOUSTON HOLDING
ROUTE 1 BOX 2
MOUNT PLEASANT PLANTAT
HAGUE, VA 22469
(804) 472 2026
COUNSEL PRO SE

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

FOR CLARENCE H. HOLDING. CLARENCE H. HOLDI DING & COMPAMY

CLARENCE HOUSTON HOLDING, COUNSEL PROSE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY I SENT COPIED TO ALL COUNSEL OF DEFRNDANTS 8/29/92
CLARENCE HOUSTON HOLDING
SIGNED

V I R G I N I A

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY

CLARENCE H. HOLDING, CLARENCE H. HOLDING & COMPANY, PLANTIFF,

V. # 91-69

LEWIS BROTHERS, JR,, MAX ZOECKLER, JOHN W. PARTHUM , BRIAN SILVERMAN, MADELINE T. WATTS, DEFENDANTS.

MOTION FOR DAMAGES AND JUDGMENT

COMES NOW CLARENCE H. HOLDING, CLARENCE H. HOLDING & COMPANY BU COUNSEL AND FILES HIS MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AND DA MAGES FOR IRREPARRABLE PERSONAL INJURIES, MENTAL SUFFERINGS INJURIES TO PROPERTIES SUSTAINED AS A RESULT OF THE DEFEND ANTS DELIBERATE, INTENTIONAL, VICIOUS, WITH MALICE CHARGE AND ARREST OF MR. HOLDING FOR A FELONY CRIMINAL CHARGE OF EMBEZZLEMENT OF $10,000 FROM MADELINE T. WATTS.THE CRIME OF ENBEZZELEMENT CHARGE OF $10,000 WAS DISMISSED ON JANUA RY 11,1990BY JUDGE HYDE IN ESSEX GENERAL DISTRICT COURT . MR. HOLDING ASK FOR $10,000,000 compensatory damages from EACH AND 3 TIMES IN PUNITIVE DAMAGES FROM EACH .

1. THE DEFENDANTSHAD MR. HOLDING ARRESTED ON A CRIMIN AL FELONY CHARGE OF EMBEZZLEMENT OF $ 10,000 FROM MADELINE T. WATTS ON SEPTEMBER 2, 1989(89).

2. THE CRIMINAL FELONY CHARGE WAS DISMISSED BY JUDGE HYDE ON JANUARY 11,1990 .

3. THE CHARGE AND ARREST OF FELONY EMBEZZLWMENT OF $10,

000 AND THE DISMISSAL ON JANUARY 11,1990 FORMS THE BASIS FOR THIS ACTION FOR JUDGMENT AND BAMAGES, IRREPARABLE PERSONAL INJU JURIES, MENTAL SUFFERINGS, PERMANENT DAMAGES, HUMILUATION , DAMAGESTO CHARACTER , INTEGRITY , PERSON, BUSINESSES LIFE OF IMPECCABLE INTEGRITY, INJURIES TO PROPERTIES, CHARACTER, LIFE.

4. MR. HOLDING HAS SUFFERED AND SUSTAINED $10,000,000 IN IN COMPENSATORY DAMAGES FROM EACH DEFENDANT AND TRIPLE PUNI TIVE DAMAGES FROM EACH DEFENDANTS.

5. MR. HOLDING THEREFORE ASK FOR $10,000,000 COMPENSATORY DAMAGES FROM EACH DEFENDANTS AND 3 TIMES FROM EACH DEFENDANT IN PUNITIVE DAMAGES.

6. MR. HOLDING DEMANDS THEREFORE AND ASK $10,000,000 FROM EACH IN COMPENSATORY DAMAGES AND TRIPLE PUNITIVE DAMAGES FROM EACH DEFENDANTS FOR THE DAMAGES AND IRREPARABLE PERMANENT PERSONAL INJURIES STAINED, PLUS MENTAL SUFFERINGS, DAMAGES TO PERSON, INTEGRITY,BUSINESSES, PRPOERTIES, ESTATES.

7. THE DEFENDANTS ARE CONSPIRATORS IN THE FELONY CHARGE AND ARREST OF MR. HOLDING. IN A CONSPIRACY.

WHEREFORE, FOR TRUE HONEST CAUSES SHOWN ABOVE AND TO ENABLE THE ENDS OF TRUE HONORABLE JUSTICE TO PREVAIL , MR. HOLDING ASK AND DEMANDS $10,000,000 COMPENSATORY DAMAGES FROM EACH DEFENDANTS ANDALSO TRIPLE DAMAGES OF $10,000,000 PUNITIVE DAMAGES FROM EACH DEFENDANTS IN DAMAGES.

SIGNED
CLARENCE HOUSTON HOLDING,
BY:
HAGUE, VA . 22469
(804) 222026

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

SIGNED CLARENCE HOUSTON HOLDIN
CLARENCE H. HOLDING BY COUNSEL PRO SE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY I SENT POSTAGE PAID A COPY TO COUNSELS OF DEFEND

ANT ON SEPTEMBER 3, 1991 . ALSO I PAID S25 -$5 FOR SERVICE

OF THE SHERIFF FOR THE 5 DEFENDANTS.

LARENCE HOUSTON HOLDING
UTE1 BOX 2
OUNT PLEASANT PLANTATATION
AGUE, VA. 22469
804) 472 2026

SIGNED

SIGNED

CLARENCE HOUSTON HOLDING,

COUNSEL FOR PLANTIFF PRO SE.

OUNSEL FOR PLANTIFF PRO SE.

A F F I D A V I T

COMES NOW CLARENCE H. HOLDING OF ROUTE 1 BOX 2 , MOUNT PLE ASANT PLANTATION, HAGUE, VA. 22469 and gives his affidavit UNDER OATH AFTER FIRST BEING SWORN , GIVES HIS AFFIDAVIT HERETOFORE UNEQUIVICABLLY AND CATORGORICALLY STATES AS FOL LOWS: LEWIS BROTHERS, JR. . MAX ZOECKLER, JOHN W. PARTHUM, DAVID SILVERMAN , MADELINE T. WATTS DID IN COLLUSION AND CONSPIRACY DID WITH MALICE ON SEPTEMBER 2, 1989 AT THE HOME OF CLA CLARENCE H. HOLDING T/A CLARENCE H. HOLDING AND COMPANY AT MOUNT PLEASANT PLANTATION, HAGUE VA. 22469 , WESTMORELAND COUNTY ARRESTED MR. HOLDING ON A CRIMAL WARRANT FELONY FOR EMBEZZLEM ENT OF CHECK OF $10,000 PAID TO HIM BY MRS, MADELINE T. WATTS.

THE EMBEZZLEMENT CHARGE WAS DISMISSED BY JUDGE HYDE OF THE GENERAL DISTRICT COURT ON JANUARY 11, 1990. IN ESSEX COUNTY .

1. AS A RESULT OF THE ACTIONS MR. HOLDING HAS SUSTAINED GREAT PERMEANT PERSONAL INJURIES, PERMANENT GREAT HUMILATION, PERMANENT MENTAL ANQUISH AND SUFFERINGS , ALSO SUFFERED SUFFERED OERMANENT DAMAGES AND INJURIES TO HIS LIFE TIME OF IMPECCABLE INTEGRITY OF 71 YEARS, HIS CHARACTER, HIS PERSON, HIS LIFE, , TO HIS WORK OF 43 YEARS IN THE SECURITIES FINANC CIAL PRIFESSION, OWNER AND OPERATOR OF HIS BROKERAGE SECURITI ES FIRM WITHOUT ONE SINGLE COMPLAINT, OTHER BUSINESSES.

LIFE

2. FOR W HICH MR. HOLDING IS ENTITLED TO RECOVER FROM EA CH DEFENDANTS ENUMERATED ABOVE IN COMPENSATORY DAMAGES THE SUM OF $10,000,000 FROM ECH DEFENDANT AND TRIPLE TIMES PUNITIVE

E

DAMAGES OF $10,000,000FROM EACH DEFENDANT.

3. EACH OF THE DEFENDANTS DID DELIBERTLY AND INTENTIONALL Y, WITH MALICEEAND IN COLLUSION WITH EACH OTHER CONSPIRED IN A CONSPIRACY TO PERSONALLY DESTROY , TO HARM , TO HURT, IN ANY WAY THEY COULD BY FALSELY, FRADULENTLY WITH UTTER DIS RE GARD FOR JUSTICE AND THE RIGHTS OF MR. HOLDING CAUSING MR. HOLDING GREAT PERMANENT PERSONAL INJURIES , INJURIES TO HIS PERSON, HIS CHARACTER, TO HIS 71 YEARS OF IMPECCABLE INTEGRITY SUFFERED GREAT PERMANENT INJURIES TO HIS BUSINESSES AND PROF FESIONS OF 43 YEARS Of OWNER AND OPERATOR OF HIS BROKRAGE FIRM IN VIRGINIA AND NORTH CAROLINA. MR. HOLDING HAS SUFFERED GREAT AND PERMANENT INJURIES , MENTAL SUFFERING, MENTAL ANQ UISH, HUMILUATION , GREAT EMBARRASSMENT AND GREAT UNTOLD FUTURE PERMANENT DAMAGES, PEESONAL INJURIES.

WHEREBY , FOR GOOD CAUSES GIVEN AND SHOWN AND TO THE ENDS OF GOOD JUSTICE , RESPECT AND WHAT IS RIGHT AND JUST , MR. HOL DING DEMANDS FIRMLY $10,000,000 IN COMPENSATORY DAMAGES FROM EACH DEFENDANTS AND TRIPLE (3) TIMES $10,000,000 PUNITIVE DAMAGES FROM EACH DEFENDANTS, COST , AND INTEREST FROM SEPT EMBER 2, 1989(1989) AT 12 % PER ANNUM UNTIL FULLY PAID,

NOTARY PUBLIC CERTIFICATION AFFIANT CLARENCE H. HOLDING (SIGNED)

ADDRESS ROUTE 1 BOX 2

signed in the presence of MAGUE , VA 22469

SIGNED JOANNE M. PRESNELL ,NOTARY
PUBLIC IN FOR COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA AT LARGE
COMMISSION EXPIRES 3/31/95
SIGNED JOANNE M. PRESNELL

11/8/91

VIRGINIA

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA HELD IN THE SUP COURT BUILDING IN THE CITY OF RICHMOND ON FRIDAY 18, september 1992.

CLARENCE H. HOLDING APPELLANT,

AGAINST RECORD NO. 920336
CIRCUIT COURT NO. 91-69

LEWIS BROTHERS, JR., ET AL., APPELLEES.

UPON A PETITION FOR REHEARING

ON CONSIDERATION OF THE PETITION OF APPELLANT TO SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT RENDERED AND AN ORDER ENTERED HEREIN ON THE 14th AUGUST, 1992 AND GRANT A REHEARING THEREOF, THE PRAYER OF THE SAID PETITION IS DENIED.

A COPY,

TESTE:

DAVID BEACH

CLERK

B

VIRGINIA

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA HELD AT THE SUP PREME COURT BUILDING IN THE CITY OF RICHMOND ON FRID AY THE 14th DAY OF AUGUST, 1992.

IN RE: CLARENCE H. HOLDING, PETITIONER

RECORD NO. 920796
CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY 91-69
UPON A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

ON CONSIDERATION OF THIS CASE, THE COURT IS OF OPINI ON THAT THE WRIT OF MANDAMUS SHOULD NOT ISSUE AS PRAYED FOR. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT THE PETITION BE DIS MISSED AND THAT THE RESPONDANT RECOVER HIS COSTS BY HIM EXPENDED ABOUT HIS DEFENSE HEREIN.

A COPY,

TESTE:
DAVID B BEACH,
CLERK
BY : PATRICIA H K
DEPUTY CLERK

VIRGINIA:

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA HELD AT THE SUPREME COURT BUILDING IN THE CITY OF RICHMND ON FRIDAY 14th, OF AUGUST, 1992 .

CLARENCE H. HOLDING, APPELLANT,

AGAINST RECORD NO. 920336
CIRCUIT COURT NO. 91-69

LEWIS BROTHERS, JR. ET AL ., APPELLEES .

FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY

UPOM REVIEW OF THE RECORD IN THIS CASE AND CONSID ERATION OF THE ARGUMENTS SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF AND OPPOSITION TO THE GRANTING OF AN APPEAL, THE COURT IS OF OPINION THERE IS NO REVERSIBLE ERROR IN THE JUDGMENT COMPLAINED OF, ACCORDINGLY, THE COURT RE FUSES THE PETITION FOR APPEAL.

ACOPY,

TESTE:

DAVID B. BEACH,
CLERK

SIGN
BY: DEPUTY CLERK.

VIRGINIA :

IN THE SUPREME COURT HELD AT THE SUPREME COURT BUI LDING IN THE CITY OF RICHMOND ON FRIDAY TH 14th AUG UST, 1992.

CLARENCE H. HOLDING, APPELLANT,

AGAINST RECORD NO. 920336
CIRCUIT COURT NO. 91-69

LEWIS W. BROTHERS, JR. ET AL., APPELLEES.

FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY

ON AUGUST 10, 1992 CAME THE APPELLANT , IN PROPER PERSON, AND FILLED A PLEADING ENTITLED " DEMAND JUDGM ENT " IN THE ABOVE STYLED CASE.

IN CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, THE COURT DENIES SAID PLEADING.

A COPY ,

TESTE:

DAVID B. BEACH
CLERK

BY SI GNED
DEPUTY CLERK

VIRGINIA

IN THE SUPREME COURT AT THE SUPREME COURT BUILDING IN RICHMOND ON FRIDAY 14th AUGUST , 1992.

IN RE: CLARENCE H. HOLDING, PETITIONER

RECORD NO. 920796
920336

UPON A PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

ON AUGUST 10 , 1992 CAME THE PETITIONER, IN PERSON , AND FILED A " DEMAND JUDGMENT ON MANDAMUS" IN THIS CASE.

ON CONSIDERATION THEREOF, THE " DEMAND JUDGMENT " IS DENIED.

A COPY,

TESTE :

DAVID B. VEACH
CLERK

BY: PATRICIA H. K.
DEPUTY CLERK

VIRGINIA

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA HELD AT THE SUPREME COURT BUILDING IN THE CITY OF RICHMOND ON THESDAYthe 17th MARCH , 1992.

CLARENCE H.HOLDING, APPELLANT,

AGAINST RECORDNO. 920336
CIRCUIT COURT NO. 91-69

LEWIS W. BROTHERS, JR. ET,AL, APPELLEES.

FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY

ON MARCH 12, 1992 CAME THE APPELLANT, IN PROPER PERSON, AND FILED WITH CHIEF JUSTICE CARRICO A MOTION TO DISQUALIFY THE HONORABLE J.E. SPRUILL, JR. ,JUDGE FROM PARTICIPATING IN THIS CASE.

ON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, THE MOTION IS DENIED.

A COPY ;

TESTE :

DAVID B BEACH
CLERK

BY PATRICIA H. KRUEGAR
DEPUTY CLERK .

V I R G I N I A

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY

CLARENCE H. HOLBING, PLANTIFF,

V. # 91-69

LEWIS W. BROTHERS, JR.,, MAX ZOECKLER, JOHN W. PARTHUM, BRIAN SILVERMAN , MADELINE T. WATTS, DEFENDANTS.

ORDER

THIS CAUSE CAME TO BE HEARD ON NOVEMBER 13,1991 , ON THE PLANTIFF,S MOTION FOR JUDGMWNNT AND THE DEFENDANTS PLEA OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS. MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE , AND MOT ION PURSUANT TO S 801-271.1of the code of va. 1950, amende d and was argued BY PLANTIFF PRO SE AND BY COUNSEL FOR DEF ENDANTS.

WHEREFORE, IT APPEARING UNTO THE COURT THAT THE PLANTIFF,S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ALLEGED A MALICIOUS PROSECUTION ON THE PART OF THE DEFENDANTS ;THAT THE APPLICABLE STATUTE OF LIMIT FOR THE PLAMTIFF,S CAUSE OF ACTION IS SEC 8.01-248 of VA 1950 AMENDED : AND THE DEFENDANTS PLEA IS VALID DEFENSE TO THE WHOLE OF THE PLANTIFF,S CAUSE OF ACTION AS SET FORTH IN HIS MOTION FOR JUDGMENT FILED HEREIN; AND

WHEREFORE IT APPEARING UNTO THE COURT THE PLANTIFF,S AC TION WAS BARRED BY THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS, THE

THE COURT DID NOT NEED TO REACH THE ISSUE OF TRANSFER OF VENUE: THAT THE PLANTIFF,S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT WAS NOT GROUNDED IN FACT WARRANTED BY EXISTING LAW OR A GOOD FAITH ARGUMENT FOR EXTENSION, MODIFICATION OR RE VERSAL OF EXISTING LAW: AND THAT THE PLANTIFF,S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT WAS IN VIOLATION OF S 8.01-271.1 OF THE CODE OF VA., 1959, AS AMENDED;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COURT DOTH ADJUDGE, ORDER AN D DECREE AS FOLLOWS;

(1) THAT THE DEFENDANTS PLEA OF THE STATUTE OF LIM ITATIONS BE, AND IT IS HEREBY SUSTAINED;

(2) THAT THE DEFENDANT, MADELINE T. WATTS, RECOVER FROM CLARENCE H. HOLDING, TWO HUNDRED FIFTY DOLLARS(250) THE AMOUNT OF REASONABLE EXPENSES INCURRED BY THE DEFENDANT MADELINE T. WATTS BECAUSE OF FILING OF THE PLANTIFF,S MOTION OF JUDGMENT , AND THE PLANTIFF SHALL PAY CRANE*SN EAD& ASSOCIATES, INC. THE SUM OF $70.00 FOR RECORDING THE HEARING IN THIS SUIT AS COST OF THIS PROCEEDING, AND (3) THAT THIS ACTION BE , AND IT IS HEREBY, DISMISSED, TO WH ICH ACTION OF THE COURT THE PLANTIFF DULY EXCETED.

TRUE COPY ENTER: LAW DATE 12/12/91
TESTE: CHEATHEM SIGNED JOSEPH E SPRUILL, JR. JUDGE
DEPUTY CLK

WE ASK FOR THIS:
R. MICHAEL MCKENNEY , COUNSEL FOR BROTHERS, et.al. DEFS
JOHN W. WARE, FOR MADELINE T. WATTS
SEEN AND OBJECTED TO * HOLDING DID NOT SIGN NOR SAW

VIRGINIA

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY

CLARENCE H. HOLDING, PLAINTIFF,

V. ORDER NO. 91-69

LEWIS W. BROTHERS, JR. et AL., DEFENDANTS.

ORDER

THIS CAUSE CAME TO BE HEARD ON DECEMBER 12,1991,ON THE PLANTIFF,S " MOTION AND DEMAND TO SET ASIDE AND DISMISS ORDER NOVEMBER 13,1991 OF ONE YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS" AND ALSO PLANTIFF,S "MOTION TO SET ASIDE AND DISMISS SAN CTIONS IMPOSED NOVEMBER 13,1991" and was argued by the PLANTIFF PRO SE AND BY COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANTS.

WHEREFORE, IT APPEARIND TO THE COURT AFTER MATURE CONSIDE... ERATION OF SAID MOTIONS AND ALL GROUNDS THEREOF, AND THE AUTHORITIES SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT THEREOF,THAT SAID MOTIONS SHOULD BE OVERRULED; NOW, THEREFORE, THE COURT DOTH ADJUD GE, ORDER, AND DECREE THAT PLAINTIFF,S "MOTION AND DEMAN D TO SET ASIDE AND DISMISS ORDER OF NOVEMBER 13,19912 ARE DENIED; THAT THE PLANTIFF SHALL PAY CRANE SNEAD AND ASSOC IATES, INC. THE SUM OF ONE HUNDRED THREE DOLLARS FOR RE CORDING THE HEARING ON THIS MOTION AS COST OF THIS PRO CEEDING; AND THAT THE REQUIREMENT OF ENDORSEMENT BY COU NSEL OF RECORD OF THIS ORDER BE DISPENSED WITH PURSUANT TO RULE 1:13 OF RULES OF SUPREME COURT OF VA.

AND HAVE JUDGMENT AGAINST THE PLANTIFF, CLARENCE H. HOLDING IN THE SUM OF $500.00 , THE AMOUNTT OF REASONABLE EXPENSES INCURRED BY THE DEFENDANT, MADELINE T. WATTS, BECAUSE OF FILING OF THE PLANTIFF,S STATEMENT OF FACTS OF THE CASE WAS IN VIOLATION OF SECTION 8.01-271.1 OF THE CODE AS AMENDED.

(2) THAT THE REQUIREMENT OF ENDORSEMENT BY COUNSEL OF RECORD BE DISPENSED WITH PURSUANT TO RULE 1;13 OF THE RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF VA.

NOTHING REMAINING TO BE DONE, THIS ACTION IS STRICKEN FROM THE DOCKET.

ENTER: LAW
DATE : MARCH 6, 1992

JOSEPH E SPRUILL JR. , JUDGE

TESTE:
SUSYNNE CHEATHAM , DEPTY CLK.

VIRGINIA

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY

CLARENCE H HOLDING, PLANTIFF,

V. CASE NO 91-69

LEWIS W. BROTHERS, JR, ET AL., DEFENDANTS.

ORDER

THIS CAUSE CAME TO BE HEARD ON FEBRUARY 20, 1992, ON THE DEFENDANT,S " OBJECTION TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS OF THE CASE" FILED IN RESPONSE TO THE PLANTIFF,S STATEMENT OF FACTS OF THE CASE AND DEFENDANT MADELINE T. WATTS MOTION PURSUANT TO S. 8.01-272.1 of CODE OF VA AMENDED AND WAS ARGUED BY THE PLANTIFF PTO SE AND BY COUNSEL FOR THE DEF ENDANTS.

WHEREFORE, IT APPEARING TO THE COURT THAT THE PLANTI FF,S STATEMENT OF FACTS OF THE CASE WAS FILED MORE THAN FIVE DAYS AFTER ENTRY OF AN ORDER DATED DECEMBER 12, 1991 in violation OF RULE 5:11 OF THE RULES OF THE SUPREME COU RT OF VIRGINIA , AND AND AS TO EVENTS RELATED TO THAT OR DER , THE STATEMENT OF FACTS OF THE CASE CANNOT BE FILED IN THE RECORD FOR APPEAL IN THIS MATTER ; WHEREFORE, IT FURTHER APPEARING TO THE CCOURT THAT CAN BE NO AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES ON THE FACTS INCLUDED IN THE PLANTI FF,S STATEMENT OF FACTS OF THE CASE RELATED TO THE ORDER OF JANUARY 6,1992, THE PLANTIFF,S STATEMENT OF FACTS OF

THE CASE SHOULD NOT BE FILED IN THE RECORD IN THIS MATT ER; AND FURTHER, AT THE REQUEST OF THE COURT, A COURT RE PORTER WAS PRESENT AND RECORDED THE HEARING OF DECEMBER 12,1991 NAD JANUARY 6,1992, IN ORDER THAT AN ACCURATE RE CORD WOULD BE AVAILABLE, BUT PLAINTIFF REFUSED TO PAY THE COST OF TRANSCRIBINF THE RECORD DESPITE REQUEST FROM THE COURT TO DO SO .

UPON CONSIDERATION THEREOF, THE COURT FINDS THAT THE PLANTIFF,S STATEMENT OF FACTS OF THE FACTS NEVER PRESENTED TO THE COURT;THAT THE PLANTIFF,S STATEMENT OF THE FACTS OF THE CASE SETS FORTH LEGAL ARGUMENTS WHICH MAY NOT BE INCLUD ED IN A STATEMENT OF FACTS; SUCH INCLUSIONS ARE NOT PERMISS ABLE UNDER THE RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF VA;THAT SUCH INCLUSIONS ARE NOT PERMITTED BY EXISTING LAW AND NO GOOD FAITH ARGUMENT FOR THE EXTENSION, MODIFICATIO OR REVERSAL OF THE EXISTING LAW FOR SUCH INCLUSIONS EXISTS, AND THAT ACCORDINGLY THE FILING BY THE PLANTIFF OF HIS STATEMENT OF FACTS OF THE CASE CONSTITUTES A VIOLATION OF S 8.01-271.1 of the code of va as amended.

NOW,THEREFORE, THE COURT DOTH ADJUDGE, ORDER AS FOLLOWS;

(1) THAT THE STATEMENT OF THE FACTS NOT BE FILED IN THE RECORD OF THIS CASE.

(2) THAT THE DEFENDANT, MADELINE T. WATTS, RECOVER FROM

NOTHING FURTHER REMAINING TO BE DONE, THIS ACTION IS STRICKEN FROM THE DOCKET.

ENTER: LAW
DATE : 1/6 /98 SHOULD BE 2
JOSEPH E SPRUILL, JR.
JUDGE

WE ASK FOR THIS:

R. MICHAEL MCKENNEY

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

TRUE COPY:
TESTE : GWYNNE J CHEATHAM
DEPUTY CLK